

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-10, 12-19 and 24-36 are allowed. Claims 20-23 are rejected.

Claims rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen (EPA 859500 in view of Appelt et al. (U.S. 2003/0078766) in view of Roeseler et al. (U.S. 6,317,684). Applicant traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 20 recites, *inter alia*, “a portable terminal wherein said portable terminal comprises sending means for sending a speech signal to said center by said speech communication, during execution of an information search using said text communication with said center.” Applicant respectfully submits that Chen does not teach or suggest these features of claim 1 recited above for at least the following reasons.

In the cited portions of the reference, Chen merely discloses that “a user’s voice request is translated by software in the gateway processor, and then the gateway processor logs in a desired Web application” (column 2, lines 29-38). Thus, Chen does not teach anything at all about allowing, during execution of a first mode of communications (text communications), execution of a second mode of communications (speech communications) in addition to or concurrently with the first mode of communications.

In fact, the Examiner asserts that Chen fails to teach or suggest execution of information search using the text communication with the center (page 3 of the Office Action). As such, it would be improper for Chen to disclose a portable terminal wherein said portable terminal

comprises sending means for sending a speech signal to said center by said speech communication, during execution of an information search using said text communication with said center. That is, since Chen does not even teach or suggest execution of an information search using said text communication, it would not be possible for Chen to disclose sending a speech signal to said center by said speech communication, **during** execution of an information search using said text communication with said center.

Further, the cited portions of Appelt and the Roeseler, at most disclose a technique pertaining to transmission unit of a center. Thus, Appelt and Roeseler do not teach or suggest “sending means of a portable terminal”.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that claim 20 is patentable over the cited combination of references.

Claim 22

To the extent claim 22 recites features analogous to claim 20, claim 22 is allowable for at least the same reasons claim 20 is allowable.

Claims 21 and 23

Claims 21 and 23 depend from claims 20 and 22 respectively, and therefore are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency and the additional features recited therein.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
Application No.: 09/771,880

Attorney Docket No.: Q62767

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ebenesar D. Thomas/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Ebenesar D. Thomas
Registration No. 62,499

Date: October 2, 2009